



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,601	11/12/2003	Matthew W. Poisson	BA0434C (NORT10-00363)	5855
33000	7590	01/25/2010	EXAMINER	
DOCKET CLERK P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			DOAN, DUYEN MY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2452	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@munckcarter.com
munckcarter@gmail.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,601

Applicant(s)

POISSON ET AL.

Examiner

DUYEN DOAN

Art Unit

2452

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/12/2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-23, 26-32, 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorn et al (us pat 6,772,207) (hereinafter Dorn) and Paxhia et al (us pat 6,493,749) (hereinafter Pax) and further in view of Goel et al (us pat 6,111,945) (hereinafter Goel).

As regarding claim 21, Dorn teaches providing a graphical user interface configured to display a list of switches (see Dorn col.4, lines 54-62, display a list of switches to be managed on the display).

Dorn does not teach a menu of links, each link for accessing, via the internet, a web-page generated by a web-server associated with the managed device offering virtual private network functions.

Pax teaches the concept of a menu of links, each link for accessing, via the internet, a web-page generated by a web-server associated with the manage device (see Pax col.21, lines 43-50, also see figure 6, display a list of managed device and for each of the manage device a list of links to additional pages, when click by the administrator connect to a web server to provide additional configuration information).

It would have been obvious to one with an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Pax to the invention of Dorn because they're analogous art. A person would have been motivated at the time the invention was made to modify the configuration method of Dorn to provide links for accessing via internet web pages generated by the web server for the purpose of simplify the interface and provide ease for the administrator to locate a specific configuration information of managed switches.

The combination of Dorn-Pax does not teach VPN function.

Goel et al teaches a switch offering and processing VPN calls (see Goel col.3, lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one with an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Goel to the invention of Dorn-Pax because they're analogous art. A person would have been motivated to modify the

invention of Dorn-Pax to have the VPN function in the switch for the purpose of providing security in the network.

As regarding claim 22, Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses wherein the-link- each of the links comprises an HTTP (HyperText Transfer Protocol) link (see Pax col.7, lines 24-31). The same motivation was utilized in claim 21 applied equally well to claim 22.

As regarding claim 23, Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses, wherein at least one of the links the-link comprises a link to a web-page (see Pax col.7, lines 24-31) comprising information describing users of the virtual private network functions provided by the switch (see Goel accessing user information). The same motivation was utilized in claim 21 applied equally well to claim 23.

As regarding claim 26, Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses transmitting an HTTP (HyperText Transfer Protocol) request when a link is selected by a user; accessing a web-page associated with the selected link in response to the HTTP request, the web-page comprising configuration information related to the managed device (see Pax col.4, lines 52-67, Dorn discloses configuration information of switches). The same motivation was utilized in claim 21 applied equally well to claim 26.

As regarding claim 27, Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses modifying the configuration information via the accessed web-page (see Pax col.24, lines 50-60, modifying managed device instances). The same motivation was utilized in claim 21 applied equally well to claim 27.

As regarding claim 28, Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses each of the links correspond to a uniform resource locator (URL), and the graphical user interface prepares each URL by prepending an IP address of the switch to a predefined web-page location (see Dorn when user click on the switch icon which has the embedded URL, the browser takes the user direct to the page where administrator can perform admin function to switch, the IP address of the switch must prepending to web page location in order to access switch information by click on switch).

As regarding claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 are similar to limitations of rejected claim 21 above, Dorn-Pax-Goel further discloses a extranet switch offer VPN (see Goel col.3, lines 1-7). The same motivation was utilized in claim 21 applied equally well to claim 29.

As regarding claims 30-32, 35-39, the limitations of claims 30-32, 35-39 are similar to the limitations of rejected claims 21-23, 26-29, therefore rejected for the same rationale.

Claims 24, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorn-Pax-Goel as applied to claim 21, 30 above, and further in view of Kennelly et al (us pat 6,101,539) (hereinafter Kennelly).

As regarding claims 24, 33 Dorn-Pax-Goel discloses the invention as claimed in claim 21, 30 above. Dorn-Pax-Goel is silent in regard to packet filters provided by the switch.

Kennelly teaches packet filters provided by the switch (see Kennelly col.3, lines 41-55, packet filter are setup in switch).

It would have been obvious to one with an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kennelly to the invention of Dorn-Pax-Goel because they're analogous art. A person would have been motivated to modify the invention of Dorn-Pax-Goel to have the packet filtering function in the switch for the purpose of controlling access in the network.

Claims 25, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorn-Pax-Goel as applied to claim 21, 30 above, and further in view of Teglovic et al (us pat 5,692,030) (hereinafter Teg).

As regarding claims 25, 34, Dom-Pax-Goel discloses the invention as claimed in claim 21, 30 above. Dom-Pax-Goel is silent in regard access hours of the device.

However, the concept of having the access hours of device is well known in the art, for instant, Teg teaches access hours of the device (see Teg col.7, lines 38 access hours of the device).

It would have been obvious to one with an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Teg to the invention of Dom-Pax-Goel because they're analogous art. A person would have been motivated to modify the invention of Dorn-Pax-Goel to have the access hours for the purpose of better managing and configuring the device.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUYEN DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu V. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DUYEN DOAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2452